

Matrix Theory on Noncommutative Torus

Teruhiko Kawano and Kazumi Okuyama

Department of Physics, University of Tokyo

Hongou, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

kawano@hep-th.phys.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp

okuyama@hep-th.phys.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp

We consider the compactification of Matrix theory on tori with background anti-symmetric tensor field. Douglas and Hull have recently discussed how noncommutative geometry appears on the tori. In this paper, we demonstrate the concrete construction of this compactification of Matrix theory in a similar way to that previously given by Taylor.

March, 1998

1. Introduction

In the recent development of string theory, D-branes played the essential role[1] (See also [2] for references therein). One of the striking features of D-branes is that the transverse coordinates of D-branes are promoted to matrices [3]. Therefore, spacetime for D-branes is noncommutative. However, in the situations which have been discussed so far, the coordinates parallel to the D-brane worldvolume were commutative quantities. We are thus led to ask whether or not the D-brane worldvolume can also become noncommutative.

In [4], it was conjectured that M-theory is microscopically described by Matrix theory; $(0+1)$ -dimensional matrix quantum mechanics [5] which is obtained by the dimensional reduction of $D=10$ $N=1$ super Yang-Mills theory. The action of Matrix theory can be also interpreted as the low-energy effective action of D0-branes.

Another Matrix theory, known as the IKKT model, was proposed [6] to give a non-perturbative formulation of type IIB superstring theory. Although our formulation in this paper can be similarly applied to the IKKT model, in order to make our discussion simple, we will restrict ourselves to the former theory proposed in [4].

Matrix theory compactified on a torus is described by super Yang-Mills theory on the dual torus [4,7,8] if the dimension of the torus is less than four (see [9–13] for the compactification on higher dimensional tori). Especially, in [7], Taylor has presented the clear picture of the compactification of Matrix theory on a torus. He showed that by putting the D0-branes and their images under the lattice translations on the covering space, super Yang-Mills theory is obtained from the original D0-brane action by the Fourier transformation.

More recently, the compactification of Matrix theory on a noncommutative torus was considered [14–17]. In [14], it was discussed that this theory corresponds to the compactification of M-theory on a torus with constant background three-form field and is described by the super Yang-Mills theory on the dual noncommutative torus. See [18,19,20] for the related issues.

Douglas and Hull have also shown[21] that super Yang-Mills theory on the noncommutative torus naturally appears as the D-brane worldvolume theory, and the coordinates of the D-brane worldvolume can become noncommutative. Instead of considering D0-branes on a two-dimensional torus with constant background NS two-form field, they considered D1-branes on the slanted torus obtained by performing T-duality along one direction of the torus and showed that the typical interaction of gauge theory on the noncommutative torus can appear in this system.

As is mentioned in [21], it is possible to understand the appearance of noncommutativity directly in the original D0-brane picture. In this paper, starting from the action of D0-branes, we derive super Yang-Mills theory on the dual noncommutative torus by extending the method of [7] to the compactification with background NS two-form field.

This paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we will study the wave function of an open string with the Dirichlet boundary condition in the constant background NS two-form field and show how it is transformed when we locally gauge away the NS two-form field. In section 3, we will study the action of D0-branes on the torus with the background NS two-form field, and, following [7], derive super Yang-Mills theory on the dual noncommutative torus. Section 4 is devoted to discussion.

2. D0-Branes on Torus with Background Antisymmetric Tensor

D-branes are described by using open strings with the Dirichlet boundary conditions[2]. We will consider D0-branes on a torus $\mathbf{T}^p$. The coordinates of the torus $\mathbf{T}^p$ have the following identification:

$$X^i \sim X^i + 2\pi l_s m^i, \quad (i = 1, \dots, p) \quad (2.1)$$

with $m^i \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $\alpha' = (l_s)^2$. The string tension is $T = \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}$. In this section, since the string coordinates which describe the torus $\mathbf{T}^p$ are relevant to our discussion, we focus our attention on the following part of the action:

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \int d\tau \int_0^\pi d\sigma \left[G_{ij} \partial_\alpha X^i \partial^\alpha X^j + \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} B_{ij} \partial_\alpha X^i \partial_\beta X^j \right] \\ &= \int d\tau L[X, \partial_0 X], \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where G_{ij} and B_{ij} are constant background metric and NS two-form field, respectively.

The conjugate momenta $P_i(\sigma)$ of the string coordinates $X^i(\sigma)$ are defined in the usual way;

$$\begin{aligned} P_i(\sigma) &= \frac{\delta}{\delta \partial_0 X(\sigma)} L \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'} \left[G_{ij} \partial_0 X^j(\sigma) + B_{ij} \int_0^\pi d\sigma' \delta(\sigma, \sigma') \partial_1 X^j(\sigma') \right] \\ &= -i \frac{\delta}{\delta \dot{X}^i(\sigma)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where $\delta(\sigma, \sigma') = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2/\pi \sin(k\sigma) \sin(k\sigma')$ is the δ -function on the space of functions with the Dirichlet boundary condition. Note that the integral including $\delta(\sigma, \sigma')$ in eq.(2.3) is not equal to $\partial_1 X^j(\sigma)$, because $\partial_1 X^j$ does not satisfy the Dirichlet boundary condition. Then we obtain the relevant part of the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \int_0^\pi d\sigma \partial_0 X^i P_i(\sigma) - L \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\pi d\sigma \left[-(2\pi\alpha') \frac{D}{DX^i(\sigma)} G^{ij} \frac{D}{DX^j(\sigma)} + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'} \partial_1 X^i(\sigma) G_{ij} \partial_1 X^j(\sigma) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$\frac{D}{DX^i(\sigma)} = \frac{\delta}{\delta X^i(\sigma)} - \frac{i}{2\pi\alpha'} B_{ij} \int_0^\pi d\sigma' \delta(\sigma, \sigma') \partial_1 X^j(\sigma'). \quad (2.5)$$

The wavefunction $\Psi[X]$ of this system should obey the Schrödinger equation; $i \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \Psi = H \Psi$. If we introduce the following operator:

$$U = \exp \left[\frac{i}{4\pi\alpha'} \int_0^\pi d\sigma B_{ij} X^i(\sigma) \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} X^j(\sigma) \right] \quad (2.6)$$

which satisfies that

$$\frac{D}{DX^i(\sigma)} = U \frac{\delta}{\delta X^i(\sigma)} U^{-1} \quad (2.7)$$

and if we define another wavefunction $\Psi^{(0)}$ by

$$\Psi = U \Psi^{(0)}, \quad (2.8)$$

this wavefunction $\Psi^{(0)}$ has the familiar Hamiltonian H_0 with no background tensor B_{ij} ; namely, the Hamiltonian H where $\frac{D}{DX^i(\sigma)}$ is replaced by $\frac{\delta}{\delta X^i(\sigma)}$.

Now we would like to consider an open string with the Dirichlet boundary condition

$$\begin{cases} X^i(\sigma = 0) &= 2\pi l_s n^i, \\ X^i(\sigma = \pi) &= 2\pi l_s m^i. \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

We will call this sector the (m, n) sector.

In the (m, n) sector, the wavefunction $\Psi_{m,n}[X]$ is related by the unitary transformation (2.8) to the wavefunction $\Psi_{m,n}^{(0)}[X]$ which has the Hamiltonian H_0 with no background two-form field; $\Psi_{m,n}[X] = U \Psi_{m,n}^{(0)}[X]$, as we discussed above. Similarly, in the $(m-n, 0)$ sector, $\Psi_{m-n,0}[X] = U \Psi_{m-n,0}^{(0)}[X]$. If we assume that $\Psi_{m,n}^{(0)}[X] = \Psi_{m-n,0}^{(0)}[X]$, then we obtain that

$$\Psi_{m,n}[X] = e^{-i\pi B_{ij} m^i n^j} \Psi_{m-n,0}[X]. \quad (2.10)$$

Thus in the relation of the wavefunction in the (m, n) sector with that in the $(m - n, 0)$ sector, we have the phase factor $e^{-i\pi B_{ij} m^i n^j}$, which will account for the noncommutativity of this torus in Matrix theory.

For later convenience, we introduce the vielbein

$$G_{ij} = E^a_i E^b_j \delta_{ab}. \quad (2.11)$$

We change the indices by multiplying the vielbein E^a_i ;

$$\begin{aligned} X^a &= E^a_i X^i, \\ B_{ab} &= B_{ij} E^i_a E^j_b, \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

where E^i_a is the inverse of the vielbein E^a_i . The periodicity (2.1) of X^i is rewritten in X^a as

$$X^a \sim X^a + 2\pi l_s E^a_i m^i. \quad (2.13)$$

3. Matrix Theory Compactified on Noncommutative Torus

In this section, we consider the compactification of Matrix theory on the torus with the background NS two-form field. The action of Matrix theory[4] is given in the string metric by

$$\begin{aligned} S = T_0 \int dt \operatorname{Tr} \Bigg\{ & \frac{1}{2} (D_t X^I)^2 + \frac{T^2}{4} [X^I, X^J]^2 \\ & + \frac{i}{2} \theta^\alpha D_t \theta^\alpha + \frac{T}{2} \theta^\alpha \gamma^I_{\alpha\beta} [X_I, \theta^\beta] \Bigg\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where $T_0 = 1/(g_s l_s)$ is the mass of D0-branes.

To obtain the compactification of Matrix theory on $\mathbf{T}^p \simeq \mathbf{R}^p / \mathbf{Z}^p$, we put D0-branes and their images under the lattice translation $\mathbf{Z}^p$ on the covering space $\mathbf{R}^p$ [7]. If we put N D0-branes per unit cell of the lattice, then the Chan-Paton factor is labeled by (m, i) where $m \in \mathbf{Z}^p$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$. The dynamical variables of this theory are nine ordinary matrices $X^I_{(m,i),(n,j)}$ ($I = 1, \dots, 9$) and sixteen Grassmann matrices $\theta^\alpha_{(m,i),(n,j)}$ ($\alpha = 1, \dots, 16$). Henceforth, we will suppress the N -indices i, j , for simplicity.

Furthermore, following Taylor [7], to specify the compactification on $\mathbf{T}^p$, we should impose on these variables X^I, θ^α the following relation:

$$\begin{aligned} X^A_{m,n} &= X^A_{m-n,0} \quad (A = p+1, \dots, 9), \\ X^a_{m,n} &= X^a_{m-n,0} + 2\pi l_s E^a_j n^j \delta_{m,n} \quad (a = 1, \dots, p), \\ \theta^\alpha_{m,n} &= \theta^\alpha_{m-n,0}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Now we turn on the background B_{ij} on the torus. The variables X^I , θ^α can be interpreted in terms of the D0-brane low-energy effective action as the Higgs field and their superpartner, respectively, which come from the massless modes of open string which has its ends on D0-branes [3]. Therefore, as we have learned in eq.(2.10) of the previous section, it seems natural that, to specify our torus with the background B_{ij} , we should replace the defining relation (3.2) with

$$\begin{aligned} X_{m,n}^A &= e^{-i\pi B_{ij} m^i n^j} X_{m-n,0}^A \quad (A = p+1, \dots, 9), \\ X_{m,n}^a &= e^{-i\pi B_{ij} m^i n^j} (X_{m-n,0}^a + 2\pi l_s E_j^a n^j \delta_{m,n}) \quad (a = 1, \dots, p), \\ \theta_{m,n}^\alpha &= e^{-i\pi B_{ij} m^i n^j} \theta_{m-n,0}^\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

To go to the T-dual picture, as it was done in [7], we make the Fourier transformation from $n \in \mathbf{Z}^p$ to $\sigma \in [0, 2\pi]^p$; $X(\sigma) = \sum_{n \in \mathbf{Z}^p} e^{in^j \sigma_j} X_{n,0}$, $\theta(\sigma) = \sum_{n \in \mathbf{Z}^p} e^{in^j \sigma_j} \theta_{n,0}$. These variables $X(\sigma)$ and $\theta(\sigma)$ are $N \times N$ hermitian matrix-valued functions. The commutators of the matrix variables are expressed in terms of these variables $X(\sigma)$, $\theta(\sigma)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} [X^A, X^B]_{m,n} &= e^{-i\pi B_{ij} m^i n^j} \int \frac{d^p \sigma}{(2\pi)^p} e^{-i(m-n)\sigma} \{X^A, X^B\}_B(\sigma) \\ &= e^{-i\pi B_{ij} m^i n^j} (\{X^A, X^B\}_B)_{m-n}, \\ [X^A, \theta^\alpha]_{m,n} &= e^{-i\pi B_{ij} m^i n^j} (\{X^A, \theta^\alpha\}_B)_{m-n}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} [X^a, X^A]_{m,n} &= e^{-i\pi B_{ij} m^i n^j} \frac{1}{i} (2\pi l_s E_i^a \partial^i X^A + i\{X^a, X^A\}_B)_{m-n}, \\ [X^a, \theta^\alpha]_{m,n} &= e^{-i\pi B_{ij} m^i n^j} \frac{1}{i} (2\pi l_s E_i^a \partial^i \theta^\alpha + i\{X^a, \theta^\alpha\}_B)_{m-n}, \\ [X^a, X^b]_{m,n} &= e^{-i\pi B_{ij} m^i n^j} \frac{1}{i} (2\pi l_s E_i^a \partial^i X^b - 2\pi l_s E_i^b \partial^i X^a + i\{X^a, X^b\}_B)_{m-n}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where $\{, \}_B$ stands for the Moyal bracket. The Moyal bracket is the commutator of two functions by $\ast$ -product

$$\{f, g\}_B \equiv (f \ast g)_B - (g \ast f)_B, \quad (3.6)$$

where the $\ast$ -product is defined by

$$(f \ast g)_B(\sigma) \equiv f(\sigma) \exp(i\pi B_{ij} \overleftarrow{\partial} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}}{\partial \sigma_i} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}}{\partial \sigma_j}) g(\sigma), \quad (3.7)$$

as for the N -indices, which should be understood as $(f \ast g)_{ij} = f_{ik} \ast g_{kj}$.

We rescale the variable $X^a(\sigma)$ into $A^a(\sigma)$;

$$A^a(\sigma) = TX^a(\sigma) = \frac{1}{2\pi l_s^2} X^a(\sigma), \quad (3.8)$$

and the parameters σ_i into the “dual coordinates” $\tilde{\sigma}_a$; $\tilde{\sigma}_a = l_s E_a^i \sigma_i$. Note that the dual coordinates $\tilde{\sigma}_a$ have the periodicity; $\tilde{\sigma}_a \sim \tilde{\sigma}_a + 2\pi l_s E_a^i$ and thus have the dual relation to the identification (2.13) for X^a . The $*$ -product is rewritten in the dual coordinates $\tilde{\sigma}_a$ as

$$(f * g)_B(\tilde{\sigma}) = f(\tilde{\sigma}) \exp(i\pi B_{ab} l_s^2 \overleftarrow{\partial}_{\tilde{\sigma}_a} \overrightarrow{\partial}_{\tilde{\sigma}_b}) g(\tilde{\sigma}). \quad (3.9)$$

Defining the covariant derivative and the field strength by

$$\begin{aligned} D^a f(\tilde{\sigma}) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_a} f(\tilde{\sigma}) + i\{A^a, f\}_B(\tilde{\sigma}), \\ F^{ab}(\tilde{\sigma}) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_a} A^b(\tilde{\sigma}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_b} A^a(\tilde{\sigma}) + i\{A^a, A^b\}_B(\tilde{\sigma}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

in the end, for the compactification on the torus with the background B_{ij} , we find the action

$$\begin{aligned} S = M_p \int dt d^p \tilde{\sigma} \text{tr}_N \left\{ -\frac{1}{4T^2} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} (D_\mu X^A)^2 + \frac{T^2}{4} (\{X^A, X^B\}_B)^2 \right. \\ \left. - \frac{i}{2} \theta^\alpha \gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\mu D_\mu \theta^\beta + \frac{T}{2} \theta^\alpha \gamma_{\alpha\beta}^A \{X_A, \theta^\beta\}_B \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

with $\mu, \nu = t, 1, \dots, p$ and $\gamma_{\alpha\beta}^0 = -\delta_{\alpha\beta}$, where the integration is over $\mathbf{R} \times \tilde{\mathbf{T}}^p$, and we also defined $M_p = T_p \sqrt{\det G_{ij}}$ with $T_p = T_0 (2\pi l_s)^{-p}$ the tension of Dp-branes [1]. Note that we have divided the action by the irrelevant factor $\text{tr}_{\mathbf{Z}^p}(\mathbf{1}) = \sum_{n \in \mathbf{Z}^p} 1$ which came from the lattice translation.

4. Discussion

In this paper, we have considered the compactification of Matrix theory on the torus with the background antisymmetric tensor. We have followed the method for the compactification on the torus given by Taylor[7] and extended it to apply to our torus. We have thus found that the resultant action (3.11) is that formally obtained from the standard action of super Yang-Mills theory by replacing the ordinary product of functions by the

*-product. This fact shows that (3.11) can be thought of as the action of super Yang-Mills theory on the noncommutative torus $\mathbf{T}_B^p$ which is associated with the algebra defined by

$$Z_i Z_j = e^{-2\pi i B_{ij}} Z_j Z_i \quad (4.1)$$

with the identification $Z_i \sim e^{i\sigma_i}$, as Connes, Douglas, and Schwarz have already discussed [14].

Note that, as pointed out in [21], in connection with the issue of the minimal length, the radii of the dual torus $\tilde{\mathbf{T}}^p$ on which super Yang-Mills theory is defined are the radii obtained by performing T-duality for the torus without the background NS two-form. This phenomenon is related to the fact that, in the NS two-form background, open strings behave differently from closed strings. It is important to clarify such differences in more general background for our understanding of the compactification of Matrix theory.

The authors of [14] have discussed the relation between super Yang-Mills theory on the noncommutative torus and M theory on tori with constant background three-form field. In [21], Douglas and Hull have also discussed the appearance of the noncommutative geometry on tori with constant background two-form field in Type II superstring theory. Therefore, we believe that the significance of our paper is to give the simple derivation and to demonstrate the compactification of Matrix theory on such tori from the point of the simple view given by Taylor [7].

Note added: After this work was completed, we received a paper [22] which has overlaps with ours.

Acknowledgements

K.O. is supported in part by JSPS Research Fellowships for Young Scientists.

References

- [1] J. Polchinski, “Dirichlet Branes and Ramond-Ramond Charges”, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4724-4727 (1995) , [hep-th/9510017](#).
- [2] J. Polchinski, S. Chaudhuri, and C. V. Johnson, “Notes on D-Branes”, [hep-th/9602052](#);
J. Polchinski, “TASI Lectures on D-Branes”, [hep-th/9611050](#).
- [3] E. Witten, “Bound States Of Strings And p -Branes”, Nucl. Phys. **B460**, 335-350 (1996), [hep-th/9510135](#).
- [4] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S. H. Shenker, and L. Susskind, “M Theory As A Matrix Model: A Conjecture”, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 5112-5128 (1997), [hep-th/9610043](#).
- [5] M. Baake, P. Reinicke, and V. Rittenberg, “Fierz identities for real Clifford algebras and the number of supercharges”, J. Math. Phys. **26**, 1070-1071 (1985);
R. Flume, “On Quantum Mechanics with Extended Supersymmetry and Nonabelian Gauge Constraints”, Ann. Phys. **164**, 189-220 (1985);
M. Claudson and M. B. Halpern, “Supersymmetric Ground State Wave Functions”, Nucl. Phys. **B250**, 689-715 (1985).
- [6] N. Ishibashi, H. Kawai, Y. Kitazawa, and A. Tsuchiya, “A Large N Reduced Model as Superstring”, Nucl. Phys. **B498**, 467-491 (1997), [hep-th/9612115](#).
- [7] W. Taylor, “D-brane field theory on compact spaces”, Phys. Lett. **B394**, 283-287 (1997), [hep-th/9611042](#).
- [8] O. J. Ganor, S. Rangoolam, and W. Taylor, “Branes, Fluxes and Duality in M(atric)-Theory”, Nucl. Phys. **B492**, 191-204 (1997), [hep-th/9611202](#).
- [9] M. Rozali, “Matrix Theory and U-Duality in Seven Dimensions”, Phys. Lett. **B400**, 260-264 (1997), [hep-th/9702136](#).
- [10] M. Berkooz, M. Rozali, and N. Seiberg, “Matrix Description of M theory on T^4 and T^5 ”, Phys. Lett. **B408**, 105-110 (1997), [hep-th/9704089](#).
- [11] N. Seiberg, “New Theories in Six Dimensions and Matrix Description of M-theory on T^5 and T^5/Z_2 ”, Phys. Lett. **B408**, 98-104 (1997), [hep-th/9705221](#).
- [12] A. Sen, “D0 Branes on T^n and Matrix Theory”, [hep-th/9709220](#).
- [13] N. Seiberg, “Why is the Matrix Model Correct?”, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3577-3580 (1997) , [hep-th/9710009](#).
- [14] A. Connes, M. R. Douglas, and A. Schwarz, “Noncommutative Geometry and Matrix Theory: Compactification on Tori”, [hep-th/9711162](#).
- [15] P.-M. Ho, Y.-Y. Wu, and Y.-S. Wu, “Towards a Noncommutative Geometric Approach to Matrix Compactification”, [hep-th/9712201](#).
- [16] P.-M. Ho and Y.-S. Wu, “Noncommutative Gauge Theories in Matrix Theory”, [hep-th/9801147](#).

- [17] R. Casalbuoni, “Algebraic treatment of compactification on noncommutative Tori”, [hep-th/9801170](#).
- [18] M. Li, “Comments on Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory on a Noncommutative Torus”, [hep-th/9802052](#)
- [19] M. Berkooz, “Non-local Field Theories and the Non-commutative Torus”, [hep-th/9802069](#).
- [20] R. G. Leigh and M. Rozali, “A Note on Six-Dimensional Gauge Theories”, [hep-th/9712168](#)
- [21] M. R. Douglas and C. Hull, “D-Branes and the Noncommutative Torus”, [hep-th/9711165](#).
- [22] Y.-K. E. Cheung and M. Krogh, “Noncommutative Geometry from 0-branes in a Background B-field”, [hep-th/9803031](#)